REMARKS

Claims 1 – 20 are now pending in the application. Claims 1 – 13 have been amended. Claims 14 – 20 are new. Support for the amended and new claims can be found throughout the application as originally filed and therefore no new matter has been added. Minor amendments have been made to the specification and claims to improve clarity and simply overcome the objections to the specification and rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as applicable. The Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections and rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CONTACT WITH EXAMINER

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough review of the application and the many suggestions offered in the Examiner Interview Summary Record with the proposed Examiner's Amendment attached thereto having a mail room date of February 21, 2007. Applicants regret not being able to respond to the Examiner within the time frame set forth by the Examiner. Applicants, nevertheless, have amended the application in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion as set forth in the proposed Examiner's Amendment.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Applicants respectfully submit that this objection has been respectfully accommodated.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicants have amended the claims according to the Examiner's suggestions. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been respectfully accommodated.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 – 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kelm et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,723,878). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1, which is effectively identical to the claim proposed by the Examiner, defines that the first clamping surface of the tension-bolt convex, that the second clamping surface of the eccentric cam element is concave, and that the eccentric cam element includes stops restricting an amount of rotational movement of the eccentric cam element therebetween. These limitations are not taught nor suggested by the art of record. Particularly, the prior art does not teach or suggest stops that "restrict an amount of rotational movement", as recited. Furthermore, the invention defined by claim 1 would not have been obvious in view of the collective art of record.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 and Claims 2-13 dependent therefrom are in a condition for allowance.

NEW CLAIMS 14 - 20

Applicants have added Claims 14-20. Independent Claim 14 defines, in part, stops formed on the eccentric cam that restrict rotation of the eccentric cam element in

the holder. Consistent with the discussion above concerning Claim 1, the art fails to

teach or suggest an eccentric cam element having stops that restrict rotation.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 14 and Claims 15 – 20 depending

therefrom are in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been

properly traversed or accommodated. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the

Office reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding objections and rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and

favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the

Examiner is always invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted.

Dated: May 7, 2007

Joshua B. Dobrowitsky

Reg. No. 51,288 Stephen T. Olson

Reg. No. 36,626

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. Box 828 Bloomfield Hills. Michigan 48303

(248) 641-1600